



ORIGINAL

FORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

_		RECEIVE									
2	<u>COMMISSIONERS</u>		Arizona Corporation Commission								
3	BOB STUMP–Chairman	2014 JAN 11 P	DOCKETED								
4	GARY PIERCE BRENDA BURNS	AZ CORP COMMIS DOCKET CONTR	JAN 1 7 2014								
5	BOB BURNS	DOCKET COM	DOCKETED BY								
6	SUSAN BITTER SMITH										
7	IN THE MATTER OF THE A	APPLICATION	DOCKET NO. WS-02987A-08-0180								
8	OF JOHNSON UTILITIES, L JOHNSON UTILITIES COM	L.C. DBA	NOTICE OF FILING								
9	INCREASE IN ITS WATER WATER RATES FOR CUST	AND WASTE-	TESTIMONY OF DANIEL HODGES IN SUPPORT OF								
10	PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA		SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT								
11	Johnson Utilities, L.L.C. hereby files the Testimony of Daniel Hodges in Support of										
12											
13	Settlement Agreement in the above-captioned docket. RESPECTFULLY submitted this 17 th day of January, 2014.										
14	RESPECTIVELT SUO	•	•								
15		BROWN	STEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK LLP								
16	(Step to Crock the										
17	Jeffrey W. Crockett, Esq.										
18	Öne East Washington Street, Suite 2400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004										
19		Attorney	s for Johnson Utilities, L.L.C.								
	ORIGINAL and thirteen (13) copies filed this 17 th day of January, 2014, with:										
20		, v. 1 - 11 - 1									
21	Docket Control ARIZONA CORPORATION	COMMISSION									
22	2 1200 West Washington Street										
23											
24	COPY of the foregoing hand-this 17 th day of January, 2014,										
25											
26	Lyn Farmer, Chief Administra Hearing Division	•									
27	ARIZONA CORPORATION 1200 West Washington Street										
28	Phoenix Arizona 85007										

1	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel
	Legal Division
2	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
3	1200 West Washington Street
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
	Steve Olea, Director
5	Utilities Division
6	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
7	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
8	Copy of the foregoing mailed and e-mailed
9	this 17 th day of January, 2014, to:
	Daniel Pozefsky, Chief Counsel
10	RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE
11	1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
12	Thoenix, Arizona 83007
12	Craig A. Marks
13	CRAIG A. MARKS, PLC 10645 N. Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676
14	Phoenix, Arizona 85028
15	- 110 01111, 1 1112011 0 00 00 0
	James E. Mannato, Town Attorney
16	TOWN OF FLORENCE P.O. Box 2670
17	775 N. Main Street
18	Florence, Arizona 85232-2670
19	100 00
20	Leff world
21	014676/0001\10946152.1
	·
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP One East Washington Street, Suite 2400 Phoenix, AZ 85004 602.382.4040

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TABLE OF CONTENTS							
		Page						
I.	INTRODUCTION	1						
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	1						
III.	THE JOHNSON UTILITIES PETITION FOR REHEARING							
IV.	RUCO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING							
V.	ADOPTION OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IS IN THE							
	PUBLIC INTEREST							
i:								
II .								

Testir Dock	mony of Daniel Hodges in Support of Settlement Agreement et WS-02987A-08-0180								
I.	INTRODUCTION.								
Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.								
Α.	My name is Daniel Hodges. My business address is 5230 East Shea Boulevard,								
	Suite 200, Scottsdale, Arizona 85254.								
Q.	DO YOU WORK FOR JOHNSON UTILITIES, L.L.C.?								
Α.	Yes.								
Q.	HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY IN ANY PROCEEDINGS								
	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION								
	("COMMISSION")?								
A.	Yes. I have testified as a witness for Johnson Utilities in Dockets WS-02987A-								
	09-0083 and WS-02987-12-0136.								
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY								
Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?								
Α.	I am testifying in support of the Proposed Settlement Agreement ("Settlement								
	Agreement") between Johnson Utilities, L.L.C. ("Johnson Utilities" or the								
	"Company") and the Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO") that was								
	filed in this docket on November 4, 2013.								
Q.	DID YOU PARTICIPATE PERSONALLY IN THE NEGOTIATION OF								
	THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?								
Α.	Yes. I participated over the past several months in discussions and								
	communications with RUCO which led to the Settlement Agreement.								
Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?								
Α.	As between Johnson Utilities and RUCO, the Settlement Agreement resolves all								
	issues raised in the Petition for Rehearing Pursuant to A.R.S. §40-253 filed by								
	Johnson Utilities on July 26, 2013 (the "Johnson Utilities Petition") and the								
	Application for Rehearing of Decision No. 73992 filed by RUCO on July 31								

2013 (the "RUCO Application").

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

III. THE JOHNSON UTILITIES PETITION FOR REHEARING

O. WHAT WAS THE ISSUE RAISED IN THE JOHNSON UTILITIES **PETITION?**

A. Johnson Utilities was seeking a rehearing on that limited portion of Decision 73992 (July 16, 2013) which imposed a new requirement that the Company file a rate case for both its water and wastewater divisions no later than June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar year test year. Please allow me to provide some background.

On August 25, 2010, the Commission issued Decision 71854 which ordered decreases in the rates and charges of Johnson Utilities for both its water and wastewater divisions retroactive to June 1, 2010. Decision 71854 also authorized the Company to implement a Central Arizona Groundwater Conservation District ("CAGRD") adjustor fee, subject to conditions proposed by Staff. Johnson Utilities filed proposed CAGRD adjustor fees with the Commission on September 23, 2010, and the Commission approved the CAGRD adjustor fees in Decision 72089 (January 20, 2011) for all customer billings subsequent to October 1, 2010.

On February 28, 2011, Johnson Utilities filed a Petition to Amend Decision 71854 Pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252 to correct what the Company believed were several errors in the decision. On September 15, 2011, the Commission issued Decision 72579 which increased the Company's sewer rates for billings after October 1, 2011, to address a correction in the Company's wastewater rate base and established an 8% rate of return for the Company's wastewater division. Decision 72579 also modified the late fee for wastewater service and reinstated the Company's hook-up fees tariffs for the water and wastewater divisions.

Decision 72579 further amended Decision 71854 by ordering that "in the event the Commission alters its policy to allow S corporation and LLC entities to impute a hypothetical income tax expense for ratemaking purposes, Johnson

Testimony of Daniel Hodges in Support of Settlement Agreement Docket WS-02987A-08-0180

Utilities may file a motion to amend this Order prospectively, and Johnson Utilities' authorized revenue requirement hereunder, pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252, to reflect the change in Commission policy." In Decision 73739 issued February 22, 2013, the Commission adopted an Income Tax Policy Statement stating that it is in the public interest to allow tax pass-through entities to include income tax expense as a part of their cost of service. Shortly thereafter, on March 8, 2013, Johnson Utilities filed a Petition to Amend Decision 71854 Pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252 to increase its test year revenue requirement to include income tax expense. The Commission approved the Company's request in Decision 73992 issued July 16, 2013, and the new increased rates went into effect in August 2013.

Decision 73992 also adopted Staff's recommendation that "the Company be ordered to file a full rate case application for both its water and wastewater divisions by no later than June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar year test year." It was this new requirement that prompted the Company to file the Johnson Utilities Petition seeking a one-year delay in the rate case filing requirement.

Q. WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE FILING OF A RATE CASE?

- A. Staff is concerned about the potential length of time between Johnson Utilities' last rate case and the next rate case the Company files. Decision 73992 states as follows at Findings of Fact 10-12:
 - 10. In its petition, the Company stated that, if its application is approved, the Company would not need new rates to be effective prior to July 1, 2019.
 - 11. Staff notes that the new Commission income tax policy has no stayout requirements. Further, Decision No. 71854 (amended by Decision No. 72579) was the Company's first rate case since the granting of its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity by Decision No. 60223 (May 27, 1997).

¹ Decision 73992 at page 5, FOF 21, and page 6, lines 1-2.

7

8

1

2

12.

121314

15

17

16

18 19

2021

2223

24

2526

27

28

than June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar year test year.²

Q. DOES JOHNSON UTILITIES AGREE WITH THE BASIS OF STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION?

Because of the length of time between rate cases that would occur if the Company did not file a new rate application for several years,

Staff recommends that the Company be ordered to file a full rate case application for its water and wastewater divisions by no later

- A. No, we disagree for several reasons. First, while Johnson Utilities' last rate case was filed in 2008, the rates in effect today were not fully adopted and implemented until August 2013, less than six months ago. As I described above, the Company's rates and charges were decreased in Decision 71854 (August 25, 2010) retroactive to June 1, 2010, but were subsequently modified three times, as follows:
 - The new CAGRD adjustor fees were implemented pursuant to Decision 72089 for customer billings for water sold after October 1, 2010.
 - Sewer rates were increased in Decision 72579 for billings after October 1, 2011.
 - Increases in water and sewer rates resulting from the inclusion of income tax expense in the revenue requirement were implemented pursuant to Decision 73992 for billings for service provided after August 1, 2013.

Johnson Utilities has been back before the Commission almost continuously regarding its rates and charges since Decision 71854 was issued in the fall of 2010.

Second, Staff's recommendation was based upon pure conjecture that Johnson Utilities "will not file a new rate application for several years." This possibility exists with all public utilities and it is my understanding that the Commission does not typically order a utility to file a rate case by a date certain. Rate cases are very expensive to prepare, file and prosecute, and rate case

² Decision 73992 at page 3, FOFs 10-12 (emphasis added).

³ I would note that Johnson Utilities spent in excess of \$1 million dollars on this rate case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

expense is ultimately borne by the customers through rates. Thus, in the absence of some credible evidence by Staff that there is a need to file a public utility should determine the timing for filing for new rates and charges based upon a careful consideration of all of the relevant facts.

Third, Staff has provided no analysis or any basis for selecting a 2014 test year as opposed to any other test year. The recommendation of a 2014 test year appears to be purely arbitrary.

Fourth, if the Commission or Staff has a reasonable basis to believe that the rates and charges of a utility are "unjust, discriminatory or preferential, illegal or insufficient," then the Commission always has the authority under A.R.S. §40-203 to undertake a rate review with respect to the utility and to adjust the utility's rates and charges based upon the outcome of that review.⁴

- HAS STAFF PRESENTED ANY EVIDENCE THAT THE COMPANY'S Q. CURRENT RATES AND CHARGES ARE "UNJUST, DISCRIMINATORY OR PREFERENTIAL, ILLEGAL OR INSUFFICIENT?"
- No. In fact, in evaluating the Company's request for inclusion of income tax Α. expense in its rates, Staff stated in its April 26, 2013, Staff Report and Proposed Order that "Staff concurs with these amounts because they comply with the Commission's new policy and will therefore result in just and reasonable rates."5 This same language was included in Decision 73992 at Finding of Fact No. 5 and Conclusion of Law No. 5. There is no evidence that the Company's current rates are not just and reasonable.
- NOTWITHSTANDING JOHNSON UTILITIES' DISAGREEMENT WITH Q. THE BASIS OF STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION, IS THE COMPANY OPPOSED TO A REQUIREMENT THAT IT FILE A RATE CASE?

Please note that I am not an attorney and this portion of my testimony is based upon my reading of A.R.S. §40-203 and my understanding of Commission practice based upon my experience working for a public utility.

Staff Report and Proposed Order dated April 26, 2013, at page 1.

A.

Testimony of Daniel Hodges in Support of Settlement Agreement Docket WS-02987A-08-0180

A. No. Johnson Utilities does not oppose a requirement that it file a rate case. However, the Company does oppose the requirement that it file a rate case by June 30, 2015, using a 2014 calendar year test year, as I will discuss later in my testimony.

Q. DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF THE TEST YEAR?

A. Yes. In the Johnson Utilities Petition, the Company requested the amendment of Decision 73992 to require a rate case filing by June 30, 2017, using a calendar year 2016 test year. As part of the give and take negotiations which produced the Settlement Agreement, Johnson Utilities agreed to file its next rate case by June 30, 2016, using a 2015 calendar year. This is one year later than the 2014 test year ordered in Decision 73992 and one year earlier than the 2016 test year requested in the Johnson Utilities Petition.

Q. WILL A DELAY OF ONE YEAR IN THE RATE CASE FILING REQUIREMENT MAKE A MATERIAL DIFFERENCE TO JOHNSON UTILITIES?

Absolutely. Over the next two or three years, Johnson Utilities will be investing in significant plant improvements and expansions, including a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant. Much of this planned construction will not be completed by the end of 2014. In addition, Johnson Utilities is experiencing significant increases in power costs and the Company is preparing for the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (also known as ObamaCare), the full financial impact of which will not be known until after this year. Delaying the test year by even one year will allow the Company to include the additional plant investment in rate base and the additional expenses in operating expenses. Alternatively, requiring the filing of a rate case using a 2014 calendar year test year will very likely force Johnson Utilities to file back-to-back rate cases, which would be burdensome and costly for the Company and its

customers.

Q. WOULD A ONE-YEAR DELAY IN FILING A RATE CASE HAVE ANY ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE COMPANY'S CUSTOMERS?

A. No. Johnson Utilities acknowledges and understands the legitimate interest of the Commission, Staff and customers in utilities filing periodic and regular rate cases. However, in this case Staff has provided no basis or rationale for selecting a 2014 calendar year test year over any other year, Staff has presented no evidence that the Company's current rates are in any way "unjust, discriminatory or preferential, illegal or insufficient," and I have provided legitimate reasons to support the Company's request for a one-year delay in the rate case filing requirement. Additionally, as I have previously stated, the requirement of a 2014 test year will likely result in the need for back-to-back rate cases. For all of these reasons, I do not how a one-year delay in the rate case filing requirement can have any adverse impact on customers.

IV. RUCO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING

Q. WHAT WAS THE ISSUE RAISED IN THE RUCO APPLICATION?

- A. The RUCO Application speaks for itself but in short, RUCO opposed the inclusion of income tax expense in the rates and charges of Johnson Utilities as authorized in Decision 73992.
- Q. HOW DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ADDRESS THE ISSUES RAISED BY RUCO REGARDING INCOME TAX EXPENSE?
 - A. Under the Settlement Agreement, Johnson Utilities agrees to reduce the applicable income tax rate from 36.66% to 25% for the Company's wastewater division.
 - V. <u>ADOPTION OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST</u>
 - Q. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?
 - A. The Settlement Agreement fully resolves all disputes between RUCO and Johnson

Testimony of Daniel Hodges in Support of Settlement Agreement Docket WS-02987A-08-0180

Utilities pertaining to Decision 73992 and, likewise, resolves all issues between the parties raised in the RUCO Application and the Johnson Utilities Petition. Specifically, the Settlement Agreement provides the following benefits:

- It requires independent verification that the actual weighted average income tax rate of the members of Johnson Utilities is at least equal to or higher than the imputed income tax rate of 25% for the wastewater division which the parties agree to in the Settlement Agreement.
- It reduces the applicable imputed income tax rate from 36.6558% to 25.00% for the wastewater division, resulting in lower wastewater rates and combined annual savings for wastewater customers of approximately \$289,000.
- It requires Johnson Utilities to file a rate case by June 30, 2016, using a 2015 test year.
- It requires Johnson Utilities to file yearly earnings reports, in the form of the schedules attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement, for the years 2013 and 2014 prior to the next rate case.
- It avoids further litigation and cost for both parties.
- It does not impair the right of RUCO to challenge or the right of Johnson Utilities to support future determinations regarding the imputation of income tax for limited liability companies, subchapter S corporations, and other forms of tax pass-through entities.

Q. HOW WILL NEW WASTEWATER RATES BE IMPLEMENTED IF THE COMMISSION APPROVES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?

A. Pursuant to Section 2.2 of the Settlement Agreement, within 30 days of Commission approval, Johnson Utilities would file a revised tariff with the new lower wastewater rates. The new wastewater rates would be effective for all billings on and after the date of the Commission's order approving the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement does not affect the rates for water service approved in Decision 73992 which shall remain in effect.

Q.	BAS	ED	UP	ON TH	E BE	CNEF	ITS Y	OU 1	HAV	/E D	ESC	RIBEI), AS W	'ELI	AS
	THE	2	REA	SONS	YC	U	HAV	E P	ROV	VIDE	D	SUPP	ORTIN	3 .	ГНЕ
	CON	AP	ANY	'S NEI	ED F	OR A	ON	E-YE	AR	DEL	ΑY	IN TH	E TEST	Г ҮЕ	AR,
	DO	Y	OU	BELIE	EVE	THA	AT A	PPR	OVA	L (OF	THE	SETTL	ÆM]	ENT
	AGR	AGREEMENT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?													

- A. Yes. A negotiated settlement agreement finds common ground between the parties and resolves disagreements in a way that is supported by each of the settling parties. In this instance, the Settlement Agreement, if approved, will result in lower wastewater rates for Johnson Utilities customers as described above. It also allows the Company to use a test year for its next rate case that will better reflect plant in service and cost of service, and will help the Company avoid a scenario where it might otherwise be forced to file back-to-back rate cases. For all of these reasons, the Settlement Agreement is in the public interest.
- Q. WHAT ACTION DOES JOHNSON UTILITIES REQUEST THAT THE COMMISSION TAKE WITH RESPECT TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?
- A. Johnson Utilities requests that the Commission issue its order modifying Decision 73992 to adopt and/or reflect the relevant provisions of the Settlement Agreement.
- Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 20 A. Yes.

014676\0001\10963749.1